

SECTION M - Evaluation Factors for Award

M.1 GENERAL

(a) The Government will use formal Source Selection procedure to evaluate proposals in accordance with the competitive negotiation source selection procedures contained in FAR Part 15.

(b) In accordance with FAR 52.215-1(f) the Government intends to award multiple contracts with awards made to the responsible Offerors whose proposals represent the best value. Best value is defined in FAR Part 2.101, as the expected outcome of an acquisition that, in the Government's estimation, provides the greatest overall benefit in response to the requirement. The Government will conduct its evaluation of proposals against the factors listed in Section M-4. Proposals must be specific and compliant with all terms and conditions of the solicitation in order to be acceptable. The Offeror shall clearly address each element of the proposal as required by the solicitation. Any proposal failing to address all of the elements of the solicitation will be considered an indication of the Offeror's lack of understanding of, and response to, the Government's requirements and may result negatively in overall proposal evaluation.

In performing its best value analysis, the Government will compare relevant differences among the evaluated proposals to determine which proposal(s) offer(s) the overall best value. This effort will include comparing the strengths, weaknesses and risks associated with each offer.

The Government will make this assessment through the development of trade-off analysis and other analytic studies that involve the assessment of benefits of superior technical/performance capability features (e.g., benefits clearly attributable to increased productivity, probability of successful contract performance, and/or unique and innovative approaches or capabilities) versus the added cost. Overall cost to the Government may become the ultimate determining factor for award of the contract as proposals become more equal based on the other factors. The degree of equality between the Offerors' proposals will be measured by the quality, significance, and applicability of the superior features proposed.

(c) When conducting the evaluation, the Government may use data included by Offerors in their proposals, as well as data obtained from other sources. Each Offeror is responsible for ensuring that the information provided is thorough, accurate, and complete. Proposals will be evaluated in accordance with the criteria set forth below to determine the Offeror's demonstrated ability to provide the required services.

(d) The Government intends to evaluate proposals and award contracts without discussions with the offerors except clarifications as described in FAR 15.306(a) and may evaluate offers on the basis of the Offeror's initial proposal. Therefore, the initial proposal should contain the Offeror's best terms from a technical/cost price standpoint.

(e) Offerors may propose for consideration in one or more functional categories with the submission of a separate and complete proposal for each functional category in which they wish to be considered. Award selections for each functional category will be made after all proposals for all categories are evaluated. The OMS awardee and any of its subcontractors/teaming partners are precluded from performing in the other two categories in any capacity, just as any awardees (and their subs or teaming partners) from the other two categories are precluded from performing in the OMS category.

M-2 BASIS FOR AWARD

The Government will award a contract to the responsible Offeror whose proposal is most advantageous to the government, price and other factors considered. Offerors are advised that a proposal complying with solicitation requirements with the lowest price may not be selected for award if a higher priced offer is determined to be the most advantageous to the Government. All proposals will be evaluated for compliance with the terms, conditions, and requirements set forth by the solicitation. All non-cost factors, when combined, are significantly more important than cost or price.

M-3 EVALUATION OF OPTIONS (JUL 1990) FAR 52.217-5

M-4 EVALUATION FACTORS

Proposals will be evaluate in accordance with the following:

(a) Non-Price Factors

Factor 1: Performance Capabilities

Factor 2: Staffing Approach

Factor 3: Management Approach

Factor 4: Past Performance

Factor 5: Small Business Participation (Large Businesses Only)

(b) Price Factor

Factor 6: Price

Order of Importance

Non-Price Factors 1 through 5 are listed in descending order of importance. Each non-price factor is more important than the price factor and together the non-price factors are significantly more important than the price factor.

M.4.1 FACTOR 1: PERFORMANCE CAPABILITIES

Performance Capabilities will be evaluated and rated based on the degree to which the offeror demonstrates the capability and probability of highly successful fulfillment of the OTIS requirements, through its understanding of the requirements and the DHS Intelligence Enterprise; its comprehensive and mature operational and analytical processes and methodologies; the understanding, comprehensiveness, and maturity of its quality assurance methodologies and practices; and the relevant experience and inherent capabilities and synergies that the prime offeror and its proposed subcontracting team will apply to contract performance.

M.4.2 FACTOR 2: STAFFING APPROACH

Staffing Approach will be evaluated and rated based on the degree to which the offeror demonstrates the capacity, depth, and experience to fully staff the effort with highly-qualified and fully-cleared personnel on a sustained basis through the experiences, quality of experiences, and the suitability of its proposed PM, DPM, and SMEs or designated task leads; the adequacy of the specific labor categories proposed; its capacity, experience, depth, and ability to staff surge requirements; and its depth and reach within the Intelligence Community (IC) to provide the highest-quality SMEs.

M.4.3 FACTOR 3: MANAGEMENT APPROACH

Management Approach will be evaluated and rated based on the degree to which the offeror demonstrates the ability to effectively manage the OTIS efforts through its mature and institutionalized management philosophies, methodologies, and processes and how they will be applied to fulfilling the OTIS requirements; the effectiveness and viability of its transition in and out plans as demonstrated by its understanding of the necessary actions and the realities of plan execution; the comprehensiveness and quality of its operational management plan with an emphasis on cost and resource management; the effectiveness of its subcontractor management plan; the degree of corporate commitment that will keep the fulfillment of the OTIS requirement a corporate priority throughout the life of the contract.

The offeror will be evaluated on management effectiveness with respect to participation in the E-Verify Program.

- i. Participation in E-Verify. The offeror will be evaluated on the extent to which it demonstrates current, or recently initiated enrollment; and current, or planned participation in the E-Verify Program.
- ii. In evaluating demonstrated participation, the participation may be considered a management strength relative to the extent and duration of application of the Program to the offeror's workforce.
- iii. Lack of participation in the Program will not be considered a weakness.

M.4.4 FACTOR 4: PAST PERFORMANCE

The offerors' proposal will be evaluated to determine the extent to which their performance demonstrates the likelihood of successful performance in providing requirements **similar in size and scope** of this solicitation. The Government may choose to evaluate publicly available reports, and/or data from the Contractor Performance System (CPS). The Government may use present and/or past performance data obtained from a variety of sources, not just those contracts identified by offeror. The information gathered for past performance may also be used in the responsibility determination

M 4.5. Factor 5: SMALL BUSINESS PARTICIPATION

Small business participation will be evaluated on the following:

(1) Subcontracting Plan – The proposed approach to subcontracting, including providing subcontracting opportunities for small, small disadvantaged, women-owned, service-disabled veteran-owned, veteran-owned, and HUBZone small businesses will be evaluated; including the degree the subcontracting approach includes meaningful goals to provide significant, and appropriate, opportunities for the above socio-economic categories.

(2) Prime Contractor Participation in the DHS Mentor-Protégé Program – The proposed participation in the DHS Mentor-Protégé Program will be evaluated to determine if the Offeror possesses a signed letter of mentor-protégé agreement approval from the DHS OSDBU.

(3) Small Disadvantaged Business Participation – The Offeror will be evaluated on the extent to which SDB concerns are specifically identified, the extent of commitment to use SDB concerns, the complexity and variety of the work SDB concerns are to perform, and compliance with meeting subcontracting goals and monetary targets for SDBs.

M 4.6 Factor 6: PRICE

The Price Proposal will be evaluated, but will not be assigned an adjectival rating. In awarding the proposed contract, DHS will select the contractors who present the overall best value to the Government, considering the technical merit of the contractor's proposal and its evaluated cost/price. DHS will use the factors above to evaluate all proposals for both the base period and option periods. The Price proposal will also be evaluated for accuracy, completeness, and reasonableness. Offerors are encouraged to propose at or below labor hour prices from existing contracts which have been already determined fair and reasonable. The Government will evaluate the proposed rates, to determine if the prices are realistic using proposal analysis techniques consistent with FAR 15.404-1.

M 4.6.1 PRICE EVALUATION OF OPTIONS

The Government will evaluate offers for award purposes by evaluating prices for the base period as well as all options. Evaluation of options will not obligate the Government to exercise the options. Offers containing any charges for failure to exercise any option will be rejected.

M 4.7 PROPOSAL PREPARATION COMPLIANCE DETERMINATION

The Government will review proposals submitted to determine compliance with the proposal preparation instructions. If it is determined that the proposal is substantially not in compliance with the instructions in Section L, the Government may deem that proposal to be unacceptable and it will not be evaluated further. The proposal may be removed from consideration for contract award.

M 5 EVALUATION

M 5.1 RATING SCALE FOR FACTORS

The Government will rate the non-price factors 1-5 by assigning an adjectival rating based on the following descriptions. Narrative descriptions of the proposal evaluation findings will accompany the adjectival code designations.

FACTOR 1. PERFORMANCE CAPABILITIES		
<i>Rating</i>	<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Definition</i>
Outstanding	O	The Offeror has demonstrated exceptional performance capabilities that are indicative of the very likely achievement of highly successful contract performance. There are minimal, if any, identified performance risks that might potentially have a negative impact on expected contract performance.
Good	G	The Offeror has demonstrated very good performance capabilities that are indicative of the likelihood of successful contract performance and the possibility of highly successful contract performance. There may be some identified performance risks that might potentially have a negative impact on expected contract performance, but the potential impact is not thought to be significant.
Acceptable	A	The Offeror has demonstrated acceptable performance capabilities that are indicative of the possibility of successful contract performance. There may be identified performance

		risks that may negatively impact successful contract performance.
Marginal	M	The Offeror has demonstrated weaknesses in some performance capabilities that are indicative that successful contract performance is not likely. There are identified performance risks that may negatively impact the level of contract performance.
Unacceptable	U	The Offeror's proposal has many deficiencies and/or gross omissions and has failed to demonstrate a sufficient level of performance capabilities necessary to satisfactorily fulfill the requirements. There are numerous identified performance risks that are potentially of major impact.

FACTOR 2. STAFFING APPROACH		
<i>Rating</i>	<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Definition</i>
Outstanding	O	The Offeror has demonstrated an exceptional staffing approach that is indicative of a very high likelihood that the OTIS efforts will be fully and timely staffed with exceptionally qualified and fully-cleared personnel. There are minimal, if any, identified risks in the approach that might potentially have a negative impact on expected contract performance.
Good	G	The Offeror has demonstrated a very good staffing approach that is indicative of the likelihood that the OTIS efforts will be fully and timely staffed with well-qualified and fully-cleared personnel, and that the level of the qualifications of those personnel could raise to the level of exceptionally qualified. There may be some identified risks in the approach that might potentially have a negative impact on expected contract performance, but the potential impact is not thought to be significant.
Acceptable	A	The Offeror has demonstrated an acceptable staffing approach that is indicative of the possibility that the OTIS efforts will be fully and timely staffed with fully-qualified and fully-cleared personnel. There may be identified performance risks that may negatively impact successful contract performance.
Marginal	M	The Offeror has demonstrated a staffing approach that contains weaknesses that are indicative that full and timely staffing of the OTIS efforts with fully-qualified and fully-cleared personnel is not likely. There are identified performance risks that may negatively impact the level of contract performance.
Unacceptable	U	The Offeror's proposal has many deficiencies and/or gross omissions and has failed to demonstrate a staffing approach necessary to satisfactorily fulfill the requirements. There are numerous identified performance risks that are potentially of major impact.

FACTOR 3. MANAGEMENT APPROACH		
<i>Rating</i>	<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Definition</i>
Outstanding	O	The Offeror has demonstrated an exceptional management approach that is indicative of a very high likelihood that the OTIS efforts will be very effectively managed. There are minimal, if any, identified risks in the approach that might negatively impact expected contract performance.
Good	G	The Offeror has demonstrated a very good management approach that is indicative of the likelihood that the OTIS efforts will be effectively managed. There may be identified risks in the approach that might negatively impact expected contract performance, but the potential impact is not thought to be significant.
Acceptable	A	The Offeror has demonstrated an acceptable management approach that is indicative of the possibility that the OTIS efforts will be effectively managed. There may be identified performance risks that may negatively impact successful contract performance.
Marginal	M	The Offeror has demonstrated a management approach that contains weaknesses that indicate the OTIS efforts will not be effectively managed. There are identified performance risks that are likely to negatively impact the level of contract performance.
Unacceptable	U	The Offeror's proposal has many deficiencies and/or gross omissions and has failed to demonstrate a management approach necessary to satisfactorily fulfill the requirements. There are numerous identified performance risks that are likely to result in major negative impacts on contract performance.

FACTOR 4. PAST PERFORMANCE		
<i>Rating</i>	<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Definition</i>
Outstanding	O	Based on the Offeror's record of past performance, no issues, concerns, or risks are associated with receiving timely services and contract performance. Past performance surveys and the Offeror's experiences indicate that the Offeror is capable of significantly exceeding the requirements of the RFP.
Good	G	The Offeror's record of past performance indicates there is very little risk associated with receiving quality products, timely services, and full contract performance. Past performance surveys and the Offeror's experience indicate the Offeror will exceed the requirements of the RFP.
Acceptable	A	The Offeror's record of past performance indicates that there is some potential risk associated with receiving quality products, timely services, and contract performance. Past performance surveys and the Offeror's experience indicate the Offeror meets the requirements of the RFP.
Marginal	M	The Offeror's record of past performance indicates it will have some problems meeting the requirements of the RFP.
Neutral	N	No past performance/experience available for evaluation. Offeror has asserted that it has no directly related or relevant past performance experience. Proposal receives no merit or demerit for this factor.

FACTOR 5. SMALL BUSINESS PARTICIPATION		
Rating	Symbol	Definition
Excellent	E	The Offeror's SB subcontracting goals <u>exceed</u> the DHS SB goals; a signed letter of mentor-protégé agreement approval from the DHS OSDBU was provided; and a letter of commitment signed by both parties for SDB participation was provided.
Good	G	The Offeror's SB subcontracting goals <u>meet</u> the DHS SB goals; a signed letter of mentor-protégé agreement approval from the DHS OSDBU was provided; and a letter of commitment signed by both parties for SDB participation was provided.
Satisfactory	S	The Offeror's SB subcontracting plan goals <u>meet</u> the DHS SB goals or provided meaningful or realistic justification for not meeting the agency goals.
Unsatisfactory	U	The Offeror's SB subcontracting goals <u>does not meet</u> the DHS stated SB goals or offer any meaningful or realistic justification or rational why the goals are not met. Offer did not provide a letter of commitment on SDB participation. The Subcontracting Plan fails to meet the requirements of FAR 19.704.

(Section M)